

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated March 29, 2007. Claims 1, 3 to 19, 21 to 23, 26, 28 and 30 are in the application, with Claims 1, 21, 23, 26, 28 and 30 being independent. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 13, 15 to 19, 21 to 23, 26, 28 and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,154,733 (Pierce). Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Pierce in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,096,418 (Singhal). Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Amended independent Claim 1 is directed to a method of determining a configuration profile for an electronic document processing peripheral, the configuration profile representing a set of configuration parameters defining an operating mode of the peripheral, a set of fixed values of the parameters defining a particular configuration of the peripheral, said method implemented in a communication network that includes at least one client station, at least one server station and at least one processing peripheral comprising the steps of obtaining a user identification data item from a request sent by a client station operated by said user, determining user characteristics as a function of the user identification data item, obtaining a peripheral identification data item, determining, as a function of the user characteristics and of the peripheral identification data item, a configuration profile applicable for configuring the operating mode of the peripheral for a document processing request coming from said user; and sending the configuration profile determined to the client station operated by said user.

In contrast, Pierce discloses a postage printing system including a computer, a data center and a control system. In Pierce, a user is allowed to create a user data profile file 205

associated with a particular user and stored in the user database 204 10 is shown. Generally, a user data profile 205 is established for each of the individual user accounts and allows each user to set parameters for controlling third party advertising on their respective envelopes 20. (See Pierce Column 6, lines 54 to 60). Furthermore, Pierce is seen to disclose an ad data profile file 207 associated with a third party message to be printed on the envelope 20 by the postage printing system 10 is shown. The ad data includes: graphic image data 207a; subsidy rate data 207b; billing rate data 207c and restriction data. The restriction data may include sender restriction data, addressee restriction data and non-addressee (quantitative) restriction data, or any combination of types of restriction data. Preferably, the addressee restriction data includes: geographic quantitative data 207d and recipient restriction data 207e. Preferably, the non-addressee restriction data includes: date restriction data 207f; multi-ad restriction data 207g; and ad space restriction data 207g. (See Column 8, line 41 to Column 9, line 14).

In the Office Action, it is contended that the “ad data profile” of Pierce is synonymous with Applicants’ “peripheral identification data item” of previous Claim 2. However, Applicants respectfully disagree with such a characterization of Pierce’s ad data profile. The ad data profile is used in Pierce to configure an *advertisement* and not a *peripheral*. This can be seen by considering the ad data shown in Fig. 5 of Pierce. The ad data includes graphic image data; subsidy rate data; billing rate data and restriction data. The restriction data may include sender restriction data, addressee restriction data and non-addressee (quantitative) restriction data, or any combination of types of restriction data. However, nowhere is the ad data seen to relate to the configuration of a peripheral and need not be dependent upon the printer used. Accordingly, as Pierce fails to disclose a peripheral identification data item, Pierce cannot be fairly said to disclose or suggest obtaining a peripheral identification data item nor determining, as a function of the user

characteristics and of the peripheral identification data item, a configuration profile applicable for configuring the operating mode of the peripheral for a document processing request, as featured in Claim 1.

In light of this deficiency in Pierce, Applicants submit that Pierce fails to disclose or suggest all of the features of Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants submit that amended independent Claim 1 is now in condition for allowance and respectfully requests same.

Amended independent Claims 21, 23, 26, 28 and 30 are directed to devices that implement the method of Claim 1 and further include various other features. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 21, 23, 26, 28 and 30 are now also in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as Claim 1 and respectfully request same.

The other pending claims in this application are dependent from the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed allowable for at least the same reasons. However, as each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, individual consideration of each dependent claim on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office by telephone at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

/Frank L. Cire Reg. #42,419/
Frank L. Cire
Attorney for Applicants

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3800
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

FOHS_WS 1481524v1